

This money could help the people of Flint and other communities that have contaminated drinking water. It gives access to \$500 million in loans. It is fully paid for. It is one of the few viable offsets that we have found within the jurisdiction of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee where I am the chairman, and I think that is part of the issue that we need to be discussing here. It is so important to make sure—as we look to these pay-fors—we can make an agreement on the pay-fors, and I believe this one is viable because I believe it is one we can agree on.

Last week I asked unanimous consent to have this amendment pending for a vote, but that was rejected. The second proposal was one made by Chairman INHOFE, who is the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, which is the committee of jurisdiction, and last week he also introduced an amendment that was fully paid for. He used funds that are available from an all-but-dormant loan program at the Department of Energy which is used to subsidize the auto industry. We can go back and forth about the merits of that fund, but the fact remains that it would have been a viable pay-for for the measure that Senator INHOFE laid down. It, too, was rejected even though it was effectively an offer to prioritize assistance for the families and the children in Flint over some of the major corporations, and we were told no. That is kind of where we are right now. If you want to know why the negotiations aren't proceeding as quickly and as smoothly as they had hoped, I think that is one of the reasons we are where we are.

The fact is, many of us are willing and trying valiantly, and in many cases desperately, to get to yes, but we can't get to yes on just anything. We cannot accept something that is not paid for. Quite honestly, we can't do something that would jeopardize and doom the underlying Energy bill, and I think we can't get to yes on something that provides more funding than could reasonably be used in the short term or ignores the problems that we are facing in other parts of the country.

We have looked at how we can separate this and how we can work it out as a stand-alone measure. I think it needs to be made a priority. I think Chairman INHOFE, who is on the EPW, has made it one, but I think it needs to be separate and apart from what we are doing on this bipartisan Energy bill which already includes priorities from over 62 Members of the Senate.

I don't think it is too much to ask that our Energy bill be allowed to move forward in the meantime. If we had been able to move forward as we had planned, we would have tucked this legislation away last Thursday, and we would have had a full week to buckle down and figure out a path forward for Flint and for the Nation. Instead, here we are on a Tuesday, we have a recess coming up at the end of the week, and we haven't had an oppor-

tunity to approve these almost 30 amendments that could go by voice. We are kind of at a stall spot.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I will.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I just want to assure the chairman of the Energy Committee that we are not giving up on this bill. It has too much support on a bipartisan basis for us to walk away from it, and I know all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle appreciate the ongoing efforts the Senator has made to deal with the other issue that has arisen here, regrettably right when she was on the verge of achieving an agreement here. I know the Senator from Alaska will stick with it, and I am behind this effort all the way.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I appreciate those comments, and I appreciate the support of the majority leader. I had an opportunity to speak with the minority leader earlier today, and he reiterated the priority of this Energy bill. To my colleagues and those who have been urging us to carry on and continue, know that we are doing exactly that and that I remain committed to not only the Energy Policy Modernization Act, but I am committed to finding a path forward as we deal with the important issue that relates to Flint and also relates to the rest of the Nation when it comes to the security and safety of our water supply.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

INTERNET TAX FREEDOM FOREVER ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, I think many Americans would agree with the following statement: The Internet should remain open and free. Politicians should certainly not try to tax it.

Congress passed a temporary ban on Internet taxes back in 1998. It was an important bipartisan win for the American people, but Congress has never made that ban permanent. In fact, there have been eight different short-term extensions of the Internet tax ban. It is time we made it permanent. It is time we made it permanent.

The bipartisan Internet Tax Freedom Forever Act has 51 cosponsors. It was introduced by the top Republican on the Commerce Committee and the top Democrat on the Finance Committee. In my office we have received many, many messages from Kentuckians who support this measure.

Here is what the bipartisan Internet Tax Freedom Forever Act would do. It would ensure any existing Internet taxes are phased out permanently. It would ensure any new attempts to tax the Internet are prohibited permanently. It would ensure Americans' access to information and online communications remain open and free permanently.

The House already passed this kind of commonsense bipartisan legislation to make the ban on Internet taxes permanent. It is time we did it here in the Senate. The action I am about to take will allow us to have that chance on Thursday of this week.

TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report accompanying H.R. 644.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 644, which will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 644), to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment and the House agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of December 9, 2015.)

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 644, an act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Chuck Grassley, Shelley Moore Capito, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, John Thune, John Hoeven, Tim Scott, Lisa Murkowski, Rob Portman, Kelly Ayotte, Tom Cotton, Orrin G. Hatch.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived with respect to the cloture motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I just filed cloture on the Customs conference report. The House has passed this commonsense bipartisan bill, and it is time for the Senate to do it as well.